



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

91
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,445	01/24/2001	Peter J. Houghton	OC01128K	2381
24265	7590	09/19/2007	EXAMINER	
SCHERING-PLough CORPORATION			HUGHES, ALICIA R	
PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990)				
2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530			1614	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/19/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/768,445	Applicant(s) HOUGHTON, PETER J.
	Examiner Alicia R. Hughes	Art Unit 1614

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 02 February 2007. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 4-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to the enablement rejection, while the scope of what is claimed is not, *per se*, broader than what was discussed in the specification, the same is broader than what is enabled by the specification, given the state of the art. As noted by the Examiner in item (2) of the scope of enablement rejection in the office action mailed on June 17, 2004, the state of the art with regard to cancer treatment is broadly underdeveloped and highly unpredictable. There is no one drug effective in the treatment of all types of cancer. See also, page 4 of the Office Action of 03 August 2006, Page 4, paragraph 1, lines 3-9). In light of the foregoing, the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, stands.

With regard to the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Applicants merely state assertions that are not substantiated by factual support, namely that the prior art disclosures function only as impermissible hindsight. Applicants assert that neither of the references utilized disclose the combination of irinotecan and temozolomide. However, as noted in this Office's Action of 03 August 2006, The examiner recognizes that there is no express motivation in the prior art to combine the two chemotherapeutic agents for the treatment of some cancers. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the methods of the prior art by combining temozolomide with irinotecan because one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect these chemotherapeutic compounds to be more effective in combination resulting in at least an additive effect against certain cancer cells such as gliomas. Additionally, Burton, Ragab and Friedman teach that temozolomide and irinotecan are known in the art to be useful for treating certain cancers such as gliomas. Absent evidence to the contrary, modification to combine these agents both of which are known to be useful for the same purpose, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the fact that the courts have held "it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition which is to be used for the very same purpose". Please see *In re Susi*, 169 USPQ 423, 426 (CCPA 1971); *In re Kerkhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Page 7, paragraph 3. In light of the foregoing, the rejection stands.



ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER